

REMARKS

The pending claims remain for reconsideration, which is requested. No new matter has been added.

The Office Action maintain the previous rejection of claims 1-4, 6-15, 19-25, 31-57, 59-69 and 71-77 are rejected under USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ford (US Publication no. 2002-0107939) and Nagasaka (US Patent No. 6,556,875).

The independent claims are 1, 54, and 66. New independent claim 78 is added.

The language of claim 1 emphasizes:

... associating each service with a semantic service description (SSD), ... based upon one or more ontologies ..., wherein the SSD further comprises:

a semantic description of the service ... based upon an ontology or more ontologies,

a filter parameter specifying relevance of the service based upon the one or more ontologies, and

...

It is readily apparent that Ford does not expressly or implicitly discuss semanticization of a service based upon an ontology. The Office Action, including Response to Arguments, relies upon Ford paragraphs 49-54 discussing a service descriptor 230, 245 for a service of a service provider 212, which 'is a hash table that includes name/value pairs that may be used to specify various attributes' (paragraph 49). However, Ford is silent on "***associating each service with a semantic service description (SSD) ... based upon one or more ontologies ..., ... the SSD further comprises: a semantic description of the service ... based upon an ontology or more ontologies.***"

The Office Action, including the Response to Arguments, relies upon Nagasaka for a semantic description of a service based upon an ontology, namely on Nagasaka column 8, lines 12-20. However, Nagasaka column 8, lines 12-20 discuss software functions attained by common interfaces or general-purpose interfaces, namely "outputting data (data stream, data type) ..." which could not be an '***ontology***' as would be understood by one skilled in the art.

In addition, relied upon Nagasaka column 31, lines 10-19 and FIG. 31 discuss a combination display window 480 that is a display of names of the source devices and the destination devices that have been correlated with each other. It is readily apparent that Nagasaka does not expressly or implicitly disclose "***associating each service with a semantic***

service description (SSD) ... the SSD comprises: a semantic description of the service ... based upon an ontologyone or more ontologies.

In addition, Nagasaka, column 29, lines 15-31 and FIG. 21 discuss input of instructions at the application unit 110 for interfacing a printer device 240 and a scanner device 340. With regard to the printer device 240 and the scanner device 340, Nagasaka column 29, lines 15-31 and FIG. 21 discuss respective interface units 120, 140, proxies 180, 190, stubs 210, 310, device controllers 220, 320, and device drivers 230, 330. However, Nagasaka does not expressly or implicitly disclose “***associating each service with a semantic service description (SSD) ... the SSD further comprises: a semantic description of the service ... based upon an ontologyone or more ontologies.***”

In addition, it is readily apparent that Nagasaka does not expressly or implicitly disclose “***a filter parameter specifying relevance of the service based upon the one or more ontologies.***” In other words, clearly Nagasaka’s FIG. 21 and discussion of interface units 120 and 140 to interface two devices do not expressly or implicitly disclose:

... associating each service with a semantic service description (SSD), ... based upon one or more ontologies ..., wherein the SSD further comprises:

a semantic description of the a service ... based upon an ontologyone or more ontologies,

a semantic filter parameter specifying relevance of the service based upon the one or more ontologies,

...

to provide “composing ... ***a composed executable task that is a combination of two or more of the available services by dynamically presenting to the user feasible possible executable tasks based upon filtering the discovered services*** according to ~~one or more of a context of the user and/or the composed executable task, based upon the semantic filter parameters in the SSDs.~~” In other words, Ford and Nagasaka are silent on any context based filtering based upon semantics, namely “***based upon filtering the discovered services*** according to ~~one or more of a context of the user and/or the composed executable task, based upon the semantic filter parameters in the SSDs.~~”

The rejection of claim 1 can be withdrawn.

Independent claims 54 and 66 emphasize features similar to the discussed features of claim 1.

NEW CLAIM 78

New claim 78 emphasizes features similar to the discussed features of claim 1 and is patentably distinguishing over Ford and Nagasaka by providing:

each service associated with a semantic service description (SSD), which is based upon one or more ontologies and discoverable as an available service according to one or more discovery protocols, each SSD including:

a semantic description of the service, based upon the one or more ontologies, and

a semantic filter parameter specifying relevance of the service, based upon the one or more ontologies;

...

support real-time composition by a user of a composed ***executable task that is a combination of two or more of the available services by dynamically presenting to the user possible executable tasks based upon filtering of the discovered services according to a context of the user and/or the composed executable task, based upon the semantic filter parameters in the SSDs ...***

The remaining dependent claims inherit the patentable recitations of their respective base claims, and therefore, patentably distinguish over the cited art for the reasons discussed above in addition to the additional features recited therein.

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance.

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,
STAAS & HALSEY LLP

/Mehdi D. Sheikerz/

Date: _____ December 13, 2010 _____ By: _____
Mehdi D. Sheikerz
Registration No. 41,307

1201 New York Avenue, N.W., 7th Floor
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501